

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.		FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/869,814	/869,814 07/05/2001		Francisco Javier Garcia-Ladona	0480/001210	1323
26474	7590	08/09/2004		EXAMINER	
KEIL & W			JIANG, DONG		
1350 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20036				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
William	ion, b	11, 20 2000		1646 DATE MAILED: 08/09/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/869,814	GARCIA-LADONA, FRANCISCO JAVIER	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Dong Jiang	1646	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the d	correspondence address	
THE REPLY FILED 15 July 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THE THEORY FILED 15 July 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THEORY TO PLACE THEORY FILED 15 July 2004 is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appe Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	avoid abandonment of this application and the same application and the same application are same applications.	cation. A proper reply to a chiple ch	
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ad event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later th ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	visory Action, or (2) the date set forth in th nan SIX MONTHS from the mailing date o s FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF TH	f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP	
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The database been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exter 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortene (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three meanned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	nsion and the corresponding amount of the d statutory period for reply originally set in	fee. The appropriate extension fee under the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in	
 A Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>15 July 2004</u>. App 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF 			
$2. \boxtimes$ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered to	pecause:		
(a) X they raise new issues that would require furth	ner consideration and/or search ((see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note	below);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or simplifying the	
(d) they present additional claims without cance	eling a corresponding number of	finally rejected claims.	
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reje	ction(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	d be allowable if submitted in a s	separate, timely filed amendment	
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for application in condition for allowance because: ઙ		sidered but does NOT place the	
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ecause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were newly	
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendmen explanation of how the new or amended claims w			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: 29-32 and 34-36.			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	proved or b)□ disapproved by	the Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	ent(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	//	
10. Other:	Jon	ram factor	
		LORRAINE SPECTOR PRIMARY EXAMINER	

Application No.

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303) 009/869.814

Continuation of 2. NOTE: the newly added claims 37 and 38 recite the limitation of animal models, which raises new issues that would require further consideration. Additionally, claims 29-32 and 34-36 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, for the reasons of records. Thus, the proposed amendment does not place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: claims 29-32 and 34-36 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, for the reasons of records set forth in the previous Office Actions mailed on 5/22/03 and 2/25/04. Applicants argument filed on 7/15/04 has been fully considered, but is not deemed persuasive because the issue is not merely whether screening and testing binding partners for a 5-HT5-R is routine experimentation, rather, the main issue is that the declaration filed on 24 November 2003 provides one of such binding partner, the compound HK02-01, and no other binding partners for 5-HT5 receptor meeting the limitations of the claims were ever identified or particularly described in either the specification or the declaration. It is not predictable at all as to what compound would bind to the 5-HT5 receptor, and have the claimed therapeutic effect. As such, persons skilled in the artwould not know how to make the invention commensurate in scope with the claims as they cannot envision the detailed chemical structure of the encompassed binding partners for 5-HT5 receptor.